No Smith Act for Miss. Mobsters, P. 3

Suppressed Senate Report Shows Economics of Disarmament Feasible, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 37 OCTOBER 15, 1962 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Cuba Offers Peace, But We're Intent on War

United Nations, N.Y.

The speech by President Dorticos of Cuba before the United Nations General Assembly painfully recalled that by Ethiopia's Haile Selassie before the League of Nations. True, we have not yet attacked Cuba as Mussolini did Ethiopia. But here once again one of the smallest nations on earth was appealing in a parliament of man for aid against the aggressive actions of a great neighboring Power, as indeed Nagy of Hungary would have done if the Russians had not kidnapped and murdered him. It was not pleasant to see one's own country in this bully company. In the atmosphere of frustrated lunacy engulfing these United States on the subject of Cuba, I dare to say that it was an able, an eloquent and a moderate speech. Dr. Dorticos scored a strong point at the very outset, when he pointed out that North American hostility made itself felt with "the promulgation of the agrarian reform law long before we proclaimed the socialist character of our revolution." The U.S. has yet to declare that if Cuba gives up Marxism-Leninism, it can keep the agrarian reform; the CIA's hostility to the left wingers in the anti-Castro forces reflects a desire to restore the sugar and oil properties. As much as Marxism-Leninism, we also fear *Fidelismo* without Fidel.

The War of 1812 in Reverse

There was, secondly, and this I am sure struck home with the Latin American delegations, his reference to our invocation of the inter-American system against Cuba. This system, as revised at Montevideo and Bogota, was to substitute hemispheric guarantees for unilateral U.S. action under the Monroe Doctrine. It was to give the Latins protection against aggression from any source, not just from Europe but also from North America. "Why was the system," Dr. Dorticos asked, "not invoked at the time of the aggression? Why was the system sidestepped at the invasion of Playa de Giron? Doubtless," he added bitterly, "the same system will also be overlooked in the case of a new armed aggression against my country." From the violated law of the hemisphere, he turned to freedom of the seas. His words must have found an echo among many Western and neutral delegations when he indicted our new program of "coercion and reprisals against any shipping firm whose ships carry any cargo to supply and feed the Cuban people." He said this was an attack upon "the guiding principles of the freedom of trade" and that these principles represented "an ancient victory of mankind." If the mob clamor in the U.S. for action against Cuba were not so intimidating, many would recall that these were the principles for which we went to war with the British in 1812. Now Washington is angry with London for refusing to violate them in the case of Cuba!

New Light on Cuba's Fishing Port?

I do not print stories I cannot substantiate but I make an exception this week for one I picked up along the capital's diplomatic row from a source friendly to Castro which I trust. The story is that the Cubans originally negotiated with the Japanese for construction of that new fishing port, and shopped around in Europe East and West before asking the Russians to build it for them. Earlier, the Japanese took considerable interest in Cuba, sent in rice growing experts and bought Cuban sugar. Then, perhaps in response to Washington's efforts to discourage all "free world" trade with Castro, trade fell off. Recently the Cubans wanted to send a trade mission to Tokyo but were told by the Japanese government that it did not consider this an opportune time for such a visit. The story, if true, would be another illustration of the way U.S. policy has driven Cuba into ever greater dependence on Moscow, though it would have been far more in accord with national interest if that fishing port were now to be built by an allied power like the Japanese.

This brought Dr. Dorticos to another effective point. We say we're going to show the whole hemisphere that socialism won't work in Cuba. The world's greatest capitalistic power is embarked on a demonstration in competitive co-existence with the world's most precarious socialist state. But it is hardly a fair contest. Dr. Dorticos was able to say "Now they have to destroy the Cuban revolution by the artificial establishment of economic difficulties, fully aware as they must be that the economic development of my country depends, and will depend for a long time, on the strengthening and establishment of our trade relations with other countries." To bring down the government of an island country, dependent always on imports, by a blockade is not to prove socialism unworkable. It is only to provide its collapse—if it does collaps, which few expect——with a powerful alibi: it never had a fair chance. The shipping measures violate the spirit of international law; they violate specific provisions of the inter-American system against economic coercion. Never did a Goliath stoop to more unfair tactics in dealing with a pigmy opponent. Finally Dr. Dorticos was able to indict our Congressional resolution on Cuba as an affront to the Charter of the United Nations, which calls on all countries to solve their disputes by peaceful means. Dr. Dorticos declared that Congress "takes upon itself the so-called right unilaterally to decide when, in its opinion, these conditions set forth in the joint resolution have been fulfilled, at which time the United States will be able to carry out what previously was made legitimate, namely aggression against my country." He has

(Continued on Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Humphrey Circumvents Gag to Get Out the Facts But Too Late for Action This Session

Suppressed Senate Report Shows Economics of Disarming Not Too Difficult

Shortly before 7 p.m. Friday, Oct. 5 with the press galleries almost empty, Senator Humphrey delivered a speech to a handful of Senators impatiently waiting adjournment, on a long suppressed and still suppressed report on the economic impact of disarmament. Though the Secretary of Defense had three times informed Humphrey, twice in writing, that publication of this report would in no way be dangerous to national security, Humphrey was unable to get a majority of the Senators (Symington, Church, Hickenlooper, Gore and Aiken) on his moribund disarmament subcommittee to release its findings. In a new and unprecedented kind of censorship, the report was labelled "confidential" and its circulation restricted to certain officials in the Executive branch and some members of Congress. The reason (I believe) is to keep the spotlight from being focussed on the two dozen giant concerns (see box below) which form the core of the military-industrial complex and get the bulk of the arms business.

Blacked Out in The Press

Senator Humphrey deserves credit for circumventing this censorship to some degree by putting the main findings into a Senate speech. Unfortunately the long wrangle over this report held him up until the session was almost over, when the press galleries were so swamped with last minute Congressional action that attention was least likely to be given the speech, and too late to give any support this session to a follow up resolution by Hart (*D. Mich.*) and 14 other Senators. (see box col. 2). I saw no coverage on the speech in the next day's papers but peace groups can spread it by getting reprints from the *Congressional Record.*

The eagerness to suppress it was understandable, for it carried good news about disarmament. The report was based upon a questionnaire sent out by the disarmament subcommittee two years ago before it had been submerged into the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and lost its semi-autonomous status. The questionnaire went to 439 firms engaged in arms business and, though quite complicated, it drew replies from 80 percent, an extraordinary response, many friendly to disarmament, none hostile. It showed that arms orders, though huge, are still only a small part of American business, less than ten percent of all goods and services, and employing little more than 5 percent of those engaged in manufacturing. The aircraft industry is the only one whose military business is greater than its commercial. It is in this industry that the biggest reconversion problems would arise.

Next to aircraft, the two industries most tied up in war work are shipbuilding and electrical machinery. The latter, our second biggest arms industry, got one-third of its business from defense work. By contrast, only 4 percent of the auto industry's sales in 1959 came from military orders. The involvement of industry is uneven as to states (almost one-fourth of the arms business is done in California), as to products (missiles and aircraft) and companies (24). Humphrey concluded that diversion of resources, funds and personnel from these companies, states and industry groups "can be accomplished without undue loss of economic growth or employment. But we need to start planning now. . . ." The military industrial complex would rather change the subject.

Sample Arms Business Opinion

"One leading defense company said it 'whole-heartedly supports efforts to find some satisfactory formula for controlled disarmament. . . . If the billions now being spent on weapons and warning systems can instead be devoted to lifting still further the levels of living of people; if the tax burden can be reduced and the threat of inflation met; if the hundreds of thousands of scientific-engineering teams . . . could once more turn their innovative talents to King Customer . . . the results would be invigorating. . . .' And another company stated: 'There is no doubt that a sudden withdrawal of defense business would create severe problems. . . . At the same time the ingenuity of industry and government should be equal to the challenge.'

"A third defense company wrote: 'The Soviet Union is now convinced that any extensive disarmament would cause so great an economic depression in the U. S. that the result would be the destruction of the capitalistic system. Therefore, the Soviet leaders do not believe that the U. S. is sincere in its disarmament proposals. Extensive government planning to deal with the economic problems arising from drastic disarmament would go a long distance toward convincing the Soviet Union of U. S. sincerity in the field of arms control."

—Humphrey to the Senate Oct. 5. He appealed for passage of S. Res. 377 by Hart (D. Mich.) and 14 other Senators to prepare for such planning by a study of the economic implications of our $50 billion arms budget. But his speech came too late for action.

24 Giant Arms Concerns at the Core of That Industrial-Military Complex Ike Feared

"The defense effort of the U.S. is highly concentrated in a few industries and a few companies. The military-industrial complex that former President Eisenhower warned the country against is one which appears to be centered in a few hands and in a few key places. . . .

"24 companies accounted for 70 percent of the entire defense expenditures represented by the study. In other words, of almost $22 billion in defense spending about $16 billion went to 24 companies. There were four companies each receiving over $1 billion in defense sales. Another four companies received from $500 million to $750 million and 12 received from $250 million to $500 million. . . .

"By awarding such a large portion of defense work to so few companies, the government is promoting the concentration of economic power. From an over-all economic standpoint it would be preferable to have the impact of any reduction in defense spending spread more evenly throughout the economy. And today, when weapons systems have become so complex, we have transferred to some of these industrial and technological giants great power and influence over the development of these weapons systems. The continued concentration of economic power and the loss of the government's decision-making power over aspects of defense policy are trends in the defense effort which should worry us. The fact, however, that so much defense work is done by so few companies gives us, at least, a handle in terms of preparing for any adjustments due to arms control and disarmament. We know where to start."

—Humphrey (D. Minn.) in Senate speech Oct. 5 disclosing findings of a long suppressed disarmament study.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rightist and Racist Conspirators Go Scottfree While "Reds" and "Pinks" Still Hounded

Unbalanced Is The Word for The Double Standard the U.S. Applies

If ever a country was literally unbalanced, the term applies to ours in its attitude toward two internal dangers, one so minuscule as to be all but mythical, the other all too real. The former, of course, is the Red menace; the latter, the danger, all too visible in Mississippi, from the twin menace of racism and rightism.

The lack of balance was sharply visible here in Washington the week after the riots in Mississippi. In Mississippi, no student has yet been punished and most of the rioters have been released. The Governor, though in clear contempt of Court orders, had been given another period of grace before being brought to account. No paper we have seen suggested that if ever the Smith Act was violated by advocacy of force and violence within the context of a clear and present danger, it was in Mississippi. No indictments have been sought against the White Citizens' Councils and the mob leaders for conspiracy to stage an insurrection.

Unlawful, Though All Their Activities Legal?

But during the very week in which the government was reacting with such flabby tolerance toward the right, there were three examples of the unrelenting zeal with which the government pursues the victims of the cold war witch hunt against the Left. Three alleged Communist "front" organizations, the only survivors of 13 ordered to register by the Subversive Activities Control Board, held a press conference to protest their persecution the day before their cases were argued in the Court of Appeals, the first test of the "front" provisions of the Internal Security Act.

With all due respect, never were more superannuated subversives on view. The head and spokesman for one, the National Council of Soviet American Friendship, was Rockwell Kent, a great American and a great artist but 80, a little old to be a revolutionary menace. The head and spokesman of the second, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, was Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, just turning 75, and also unlikely to bomb the Capitol. The third "front" the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, was represented by a handful of aging men, one blind, one with a wooden leg, from wounds received in the struggle against Franco a quarter century ago.

The press conference was pathetic. Except for David Wesley of the York, Pa., *Gazette and Daily* and myself, the only other representative of the U.S. press was from the Providence, R.I., *Journal*. The only wire service which showed up was Tass. Prosecution of the left is taken for granted, and few even covered the argument before the Court of Appeals (Prettyman, Bazelon and Danaher) next day, though fundamental principles were at stake, principles important enough to have evoked an eloquent veto message by Truman when this Act was passed in 1950 and enacted over his veto.

For example: defense counsel for all three alleged "fronts" pointed out that there was no evidence any of them had engaged in activities which were unlawful or designed to further illegal or revolutionary activities by the Communist Party. Government counsel, in answer to sharp questions by Judges Prettyman and Bazelon, insisted that the severe sanctions of the Act could be applied to them even though they *had* done nothing illegal. One worked for better Soviet relations, one helped foreign born persons in trouble, the last served the needs of the dwindling handful who fought nobly in Spain.

The danger here is real. The Internal Security Act permits the SACB to impose drastic sanctions on organizations whose positions on public questions parallel those of the Communist Party. In the atmosphere of a victorious McCarthyism, this could be turned against many liberal organizations.

We take for granted a most unwholesome atmosphere. Eight victims of the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee were reindicted during the same week. None of them, of course, were members of the White Citizens Council or preachers of racism. Racism is not regarded as "un-American" by Walter's committee; the White Citizens Councils have a fellow traveller in Eastland, chairman of the Internal Security Committee. He sets in motion an investigation of the Oxford riots designed to smear the Federal marshals and excuse the mob. Does anyone rise in the Senate to protest against an investigation of Mississippi by a Mississippian who is himself a racist?

But behind the scenes, the pressure from this same Eastland and his subcommittee vice-chairman, Dodd, and from Walter, was strong enough to force a reluctant Justice Department to obtain fresh indictments in these eight witch hunt contempt cases, all of them reversed by the Supreme Court last term.

Still Hounding Those Newspapermen

New indictments were obtained, though a new court test is likely to end in another reversal, particularly in the case of the three newspapermen, Shelton, Whitman and Price, victims of an Eastland committee foray into the press almost ten years ago whose main target was the *New York Times*. The indictments were dismissed for failure to state the subject matter under inquiry. The new indictment states the subject as "Communist activities in news media" but so many conflicting explanations of just what the subject was have already been given by the government and the Eastland committee in this affair, that this new indicment, too, is apt to be thrown out by the courts.

A third example of continued Leftward prosecution was the government's decision to proceed with a new trial of seven officers of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers for conspiracy to violate the Taft-Hartley Act by filing fake non-Communist affidavits. The original convictions were reversed.

Several things make this renewed prosecution particularly reprehensible, as John Pemberton, executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, pointed out in a protesting letter to Attorney General Kennedy. One is that the Taft-Hartley oath was repealed in 1959. The second is that the officers under attack all swore that they were not Communists at the time they took the oath. But instead of prosecuting for perjury, the government is again prosecuting for "conspiracy."

Every lawyer knows how much easier this makes the government's task and how much less likely a fair trial. As Mr. Pemberton wrote General Kennedy, "The use of the less specific although more emotionally tinged charge raises the questions whether the government felt there was inadequate proof to sustain the substantive offense."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cuba Even Willing to Disarm If Given Effective Guarantees

(Continued from Page One)

a right to fear in its terms "prefabricated" "pretexts for aggression." All this hardly adds up to a devotion to world law.

No Desire to Be In The Cold War

Dr. Dorticos supplemented his indictment with a plea for peace. "It has been very often stated here," he declared, "that Cuba is not a bone of contention between the East and the West. Cuba is a problem of sovereignty and independence. The problem of Cuba is the question of the sovereignty of a people and the right of that people to self-determination. Cuba does not wish," he told the Assembly, "to add its name to the roster of those involved in the cold war. Cuba only wishes to develop its economy and advance its culture and to plan and carry out a good future in peace." He said again that no attempt would be made to recover Guantanamo, except by peaceful legal means: "We shall not make a gift to the United States of a pretext for aggression." He reiterated Cuba's often repeated readiness "to indemnify American citizens and interests that might have been affected by the laws of the revolution." He said Cuba was "ready and is ready to do everything we deem useful to lighten the tension that surrounds Cuban-American relations and that threatens world peace." He even said Cuba was prepared to disarm if given adequate guarantees against aggression. He quoted from a document the Cuban Council of Ministers sent the United Nations secretariat after the adoption of the Congressional resolution (a document still not made public by the UN) in which Cuba declared:

"Were the United States able to give Cuba effective guarantees and satisfactory proof concerning the integrity of Cuban territory, and were it to cease its subversive and counter-revolutionary activities against our people, then Cuba would not have to strengthen its defenses. Cuba would not even need an army, and all the resources that are used for this could be gratefully and happily invested in the economic and cultural development of the country."

If our real fear is Russian arms in Cuba, if we really believe Castro needs these arms to hold down the Cuban people, then we should be willing to take up this challenge, to give guarantees for an effectively neutralized and disarmed Cuba, from which Russian arms would be withdrawn and see what happens under conditions of real peace within and without the island.

But to Dr. Dorticos's complaints and offers of negotiation, Adlai Stevenson replied in the supercilious manner of a suburban dowager reprimanding an insubordinate colored housemaid. To a hastily summoned press conference, he read a lengthy statement denying the obvious ("There was incessant talk this morning about economic strangulation and economic blockade. Neither of these terms has any application to the case"), restating the patently untrue (that we were merely putting into effect the unanimous will of the hemisphere) and offering only to let a repentant Cuba crawl, if it chose, to the back door. "If the Cuban regime," Mr. Stevenson said, in that prissy manner of his, "is sincere in its request for negotiations, and wishes to lay its grievances before the appropriate forum," it could apply to the Organization of American States from which we had it expelled. Then, though this was supposed to be a press conference, he walked out before a single question could be put to him.

Moscow Has Trouble With Fidel, Too

"The main pattern of the distribution of power [in Cuba] has emerged relatively clearly. The present supremacy of Castro is unquestioned. . . . The exile of Anibal Escalante this year marked Communist acquiescence in the defeat of their policy of regarding Castro more or less as a Kerensky. . . . The Communists are not allowed to hold any of the levers of power, nor to act as a fraction—indeed there is reason to believe that former leading Communists fear even to meet together for fear they will be accused of intriguing against Castro. In return, they are allowed to fill the lion's share of jobs in the State and Party apparatus. . . . The symbiosis works without too much friction at present, but its real testing time will not come until divergences between Castro and the Russians grow too large to be smoothed over. A hint of the strains and stresses in Cuban-Soviet relationships was given by Castro's two demonstrative cables last month to the Albanian Prime Minister. . . . It was a sign both that Castro wishes to participate, at least verbally, in the struggle between the heavyweights of World Communism, and that he is prepared to flaunt his independence of his Russian benefactors."

Cuba: Castro and Communism, by George Sherman in The (London) Spectator Sept. 7.

Don't Forget Our Offer: A Free Copy to A Friend If You Send A Stamped LONG Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

10/15/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except during August and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED